

**JULY 20, 2010 MEETING OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE**

Proposals for Consideration

The following concepts are offered for the consideration of the Science Subcommittee:

I. Option for Re-Scoring of Application

When a material dispute of fact exists or when new information that is not available at the time of the initial review has come to light and the Board is unable to resolve the issue at the meeting at which the application is considered, the Board may conditionally deny funding for the application, subject to a limited re-scoring of the application. The option for re-scoring an application should be reserved only for those circumstances in which the Board is unable to reach an informed decision at meeting at which the application is presented. Programmatic issues, such as whether the agency's portfolio is well-balanced among diseases, should not be a justification for re-scoring, nor should clear errors in the review of an application that have been identified by staff and presented to the Board. The procedure for the limited re-scoring of an application shall consist of the following:

- The limited scientific re-scoring of an application shall be conducted by the Chair of the Grants Working Group and one of the two primary reviewers of the application (or, if the Chair has a conflict, two of the primary reviewers). Both of the Vice Chairs of the Grants Working Group, and the Board Chair (if there are no conflicts) will be invited to listen and ask questions during the telephonic meeting for presentation of the re-scoring of the application.
- In the event of a re-scoring, the reviewers shall consider the factual dispute or new information and determine whether or not, in their view, it merits a change in the score of the application. They shall each assign a score to the application.
- If the consensus score or the average of the two reviewers' score is the same or lower than the original score, the Board's original determination not to fund the application shall remain in effect.
- If the consensus score or the average of the two reviewers' score is higher than the original score, the new score shall be reported to the Governing Board, which shall consider whether or not to modify its decision on funding the application.

II. Extraordinary Petitions

Under the current Extraordinary Petition policy, the President and his staff are required to review petitions received at least five working days before the Board meeting and to be prepared to make a recommendation to the Board. In an effort to provide the Board with as much information as possible, staff has, as a matter of practice, attempted to respond to

each petition in writing. In order to enforce the timeline set forth in the policy and to reduce the burden on staff, staff should only prepare a full written response when they believe a petition has merit.

Under current policy, extraordinary petitions should only be discussed when a Board member believes that a petition merits discussion. In the event that a Board member requests consideration of an extraordinary petition, staff should make a presentation regarding the application in open session, followed by Board questions, discussion, and public comment. If necessary, the Board may then convene in closed session to discuss any proprietary information related to the application in the context of any materials and/or discussion from the public session.

III. Clarification Regarding Appeal Process and Extraordinary Petitions

Applicants should be advised that they may only submit a formal appeal after the review is conducted if it appears that a demonstrable conflict of interest may have affected the review of an application. However, applicants should also be advised that they may submit an Extraordinary Petition to the Board at least five working days before the Board meeting if they believe a material error or omission in the review of their application may have affected the recommendation made by the Grants Working Group to the Board.

IV. Staff Write-Ups & Oral Presentations at Board Meetings

Staff write-ups / analyses on Grants Working Group recommendations should cover both the majority views and the minority views, when there is a major difference of scientific opinion between large blocks of reviewers (e.g. eight speaking against and five in favor).